



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 23, 2004

Mr. Paul Sarahan  
Director, Litigation Division  
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

OR2004-9988

Dear Mr. Sarahan:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 213459.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for information pertaining to enforcement actions against Longview Refining Associates, Inc. ("LRA"). You state that the commission is making some responsive information available to the requestor. You claim, however, that the remaining information at issue is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

....

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure

under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

In this case, you state that the submitted information relates to a pending enforcement action brought by the commission against LRA. You indicate that the dismissal of LRA's bankruptcy proceedings restored the commissions pre-petition rights and positions with regard to enforcement actions that were pending at the time LRA filed for bankruptcy. Thus, we understand you to represent that enforcement actions were pending on the date the commission received the present request for information. We note that a contested case under the Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), chapter 2001 of the Government Code, constitutes litigation for purposes for section 552.103 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 at 7 (1991) (contested case under statutory predecessor to APA constitutes litigation for purposes of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103). Based on your representations and our review, we agree that section 552.103 is applicable to some of the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

We note, however, that once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982). In this case, it is clear that many of the submitted documents were provided to the commission by counsel for LRA, or have otherwise been seen or obtained by LRA. This information is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 and may not be withheld on that basis.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because we find that a portion of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.103, we need not reach your claim under section 552.107 with respect to this portion of the information. Furthermore, based on our finding under section 552.103, we need not reach your claim under section 552.108 for the information you have submitted as Enclosure 6.

We next address your claim under section 552.107 of the Government Code with respect to the portions of the submitted information that are not excepted under section 552.103. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information protected by the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body.<sup>2</sup> TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives.<sup>3</sup> TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body seeking to establish that a communication is protected by the attorney-client privilege must inform this office of the identity and capacity of each individual involved in the communication. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a communication that is confidential. *Id.* 503(b)(1). A confidential communication is a communication that was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets the definition of a confidential communication depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body.

---

<sup>2</sup> The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is acting in a capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element.

<sup>3</sup> Specifically, the privilege applies only to confidential communications between the client or a representative of the client and the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer; between the lawyer and the lawyer’s representative; by the client or a representative of the client, or the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein; between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client. See TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E); see also *id.* 503(a)(2), (a)(4) (defining “representative of the client,” “representative of the lawyer”).

*See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

As noted above, the portion of the submitted information that is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code consists of documents that were provided to the commission by counsel for LRA, or have otherwise been seen or obtained by LRA. Accordingly, we determine that the remaining information at issue does not consist of confidential communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. We therefore find that the attorney-client privilege is not applicable to the remaining submitted information, and we determine that the commission may not withhold the remaining submitted information on that basis. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure with respect to this information, we conclude the commission must release the remaining submitted information to the requestor.

In summary, with the exception of information seen or obtained by LRA, the commission may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Information seen or obtained by LRA is not excepted from disclosure and must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within thirty calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within ten calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within ten calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within ten calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free,

at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within ten calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 213459

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sandy Graue  
Benham Companies, Inc.  
One West Third Street, Suite 100  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103-3513  
(w/o enclosures)